

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-20 were pending at the time of examination. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended. Claims 6-7, 13-14 and 20 have been canceled. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,724,570 to Zeller et al (hereinafter “Zeller”), in view of U.S Patent No. 6,480,833 to Kaneko et al (hereinafter “Kaneko”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to further specify that the acquired datatype of the converted SQL template is stored with the SQL template in cache, that is, in a primary storage memory. This is in contrast to Zeller, whose final normalized and optimized tree is stored on a storage medium “such as secondary storage memory hard drive F100” (col. 7, line 14), from which the tree can be accessed when needed. Storing a datatype in cache is clearly different from storing a complete, unnested and optimized tree in a secondary memory, and has a number of associated advantages, most notably the speed with which a data type query can be resolved.

Applicant has further amended claim 1 to include limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claims 6 and 7 (now canceled). It is respectfully submitted that while Zeller shows the application of “normalization rules,” there is no mention in Zeller of determining whether a descendent has been modified, and if so re-evaluating the SQL template and cascading the modifications to its ancestors, as specified in claim 1. In Zeller, the normalization rules are applied, and the final tree is stored on secondary storage medium, as described above. Nothing further is mentioned about any determinations or actions, except accessing the stored tree “when needed.”

These deficiencies are not cured by Kanenko, and thus it is respectfully submitted for at least the reasons above that Applicant’s invention, as defined in claim 1, is patentably distinct from the Zeller/Kaneko combination.

Independent claims 8 and 15 have been amended to include limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 1, and are thus patentably distinct from the Zeller/Kanenko combination for at least the same reasons.

The remaining dependent claims 3-5, 10-12 and 17-19 set forth yet further differences compared to the Zeller/Kaneko combination and are thus not anticipated or rendered obvious for

at least the reasons discussed above. Thus it is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
MOLLBORN PATENTS, INC.

/Fredrik Mollborn/

Fredrik Mollborn
Reg. No. 48,587

2840 Colby Drive
Boulder, CO 80305
(303) 459-4527